



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CD
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/544,399	04/06/2000	Royce Johnson	06 2916.561	8788
7590	12/17/2003		EXAMINER	
William H Quirk IV			BOGART, MICHAEL G	
Kinetic Concepts Inc			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P O Box 659508			3761	8
San Antonio, TX 78265-9508			DATE MAILED: 12/17/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/544,399	JOHNSON, ROYCE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael G. Bogart	3761	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 11 and 12 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-3,5,6 and 13 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 4 and 7-10 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 06 April 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . 6) Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

The election requirement of 6/18/2003 is withdrawn. Claims 1-13 are pending in this application.

Claim Objections

Claims 2 and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 2 and 13 each contain the limitation of "electronic radiation in a significant portion of the spectrum between approximately 300nm and approximately 1500nm." There is no antecedent disclosure in the specification to support this specific range of radiation.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sinofsky *et al.* (US 5,100,429 A).

Regarding claim 1, Sinofsky *et al.* teach a pad for insertion into a wound bed, said pad comprising a highly reticulated open-cell collagen foam (46)(col. 7, lines 12-25); and a means (34) for providing phototherapy.

Further regarding claim 1, The term "highly" is a relative term which renders the scope claim uncertain. The term "highly" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Giving the claim its broadest reasonable interpretation, this limitation reads upon the perforated collagen material (col. 7, lines 12-25).

Regarding claim 2, the specifically claimed range of electromagnet radiation is not enabled and thus fails to define the invention over the phototherapy means taught by Sinofsky *et al.*

Regarding claim 5, Sinofsky *et al.* teach phototherapy means comprising an optical fiber (col. 6, line 20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sinofsky *et al.*

Sinofsky *et al.* expressly teach the claimed invention except for a plurality of optical transmitting fibers.

Mere duplication of parts is not sufficient to patentably distinguish a device from what is known in the art. *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add multiple optical fibers to the device as taught by Sinofsky *et al.* all to provide redundant fibers which could transmit more light and back up means if one of the delicate fibers were to be damaged in use.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 11 and 12 are allowed.

Claims 4 and 7-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Bogart whose telephone number is (703) 605-1184. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday.

In the event the examiner is not available, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo may be reached at phone number (703) 308-1957. The fax phone numbers for the organization where

Art Unit: 3761

this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 746-3380 for informal communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0858.


Michael Bogart
December 8, 2003


WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700